

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/658,795	09/11/2000	Charles A. Lemaire	750.006US1	4145	
21186 7	590 09/16/2004		EXAM	INER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			PARDO,	PARDO, THUY N	
P.O. BOX 2938	8 IS, MN 55402	MNI 55402		PAPER NUMBER	
MINTERIOE			2175		
			DATE MAIL ED: 00/16/200	<i>A</i>	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/658,795	LEMAIRE ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thuy Pardo	2175				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 01 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. ☑ A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>01 July 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-16 and 18-34</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						
	•					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: A. Applicant argues that Jawahar lacks storing the transactions from the service provider and the customer into a database. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner believes that this feature is taught by Jawahar. Jawahar teaches that the database coupled to LAN stores transactions from the agent and from the customer through the Internet [see fig. 1, 2; col. 5, lines 37-46; col. 6, lines 19-39]. B. Applicant argues that the term "transaction" in the application is different to the term "transaction" in Jawahar. As to this point, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Jawahar defines that transactions include telephone calls, facsimile transmissions, electronic mail...etc, as same as the definition of then term "transaction" in the Specification of the Application in which a database transaction is an action object that is transmitted as electronic mail between source and destinations [see page 13, lines 2-21]. C. Applicant argues that Jawahar does not selectively enable the service customer to access any stored transactions in a database based on an Identification. As to this point, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Jawahar teaches that customer retrieves pages from the database for viewing using browser application [170 of fig. 5] based on identification of person who login [John Doe, 196 of fig. 6]. Furthermore, the feature of retrieving information from a database based on an ID and a password is well known in the computer retrieval system. D. Applicant argues that Jawahar does not teaching listing database transactions. As to this point, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Jawahar teaches listing database transactions that includes a transaction ID, time, and type [see fig. 10]. E. Applicant argues that Jawahar does not provide the feature of receiving transactions by a docketing provider. In this case, Examiner believes that the server 40 plays a role as a docketing provider for the agent 50 and the customer 52 who want to retrieve transactions from the database 58 [see fig. 2]. F. Applicant argues that Jawahar does not describe extracting a database transaction from an electronic mail. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Jawahar teaches receiving an e-mail that requires transaction processing [see col. 10, lines 18-54].

Sept 15, 2004

THUY N. PARDO PRIMARY EXAMINER